Dr. S. S. Rao *(Nominated)* : Sir, the amendment suggested by me to item No. 25 runs as follows.—

"Item 25 shall be substituted as follows.—

"Cocoanut, copra, cocoanut oil and cocoanut oil cake"

In this connection I would like to impress upon the Government the imperative necessity that compelled me to table this amendment. The learned Advocate-General has already informed that there are no possibilities for the trade to be diverted. But I beg to differ from him. We have to bear in mind the psychology of the merchants. A merchant wants to take the best advantage of the prevailing prices, and if there is a slightest imposition of even half per cent tax and the prices naturally differ, there are all possibilities for the trade being affected. Another factor which I want to impress upon the Government is regarding the opinion given that exports and imports will not be affected. I have to site the example of Br. Cochin when the Sales-Tax was introduced there. Having known reliably the business tricks of some of the business magnets, I have so to think that the business magnets of Br. Cochin had their offices in Alleppey, and from Alleppey business had gone direct to Bombay and other places avoiding the Sales Tax imposed in Br. Cochin. There are solid instances and concrete examples to show the merchants of Br. Cochin having opened their offices in Mattancheri when Sales Tax was introduced in Br. Cochin. I think these are all concrete and solid facts to prove the possibilities of the exports and imports of our own port being affected when the Sales Tax is introduced here. Having placed all the facts which are quite relevant and quite reliable and feeling that the assurance given by the Hon'ble President will surely work its way for the betterment of the business prospects, I would inform the House that I do not wish to move this amendment.

Amendment not moved

Amendment to item No 26 also was not moved

Dr. S. S. Rao *(Nominated)*: Sir, my next amendment is.—

Add the following as items 28, 29 and 30.—

"28. Pepper
29. Ginger
30. Turmeric"

This particularly relates to the exemption of the three products mentioned in the amendment from the Sales Tax. I have particularly to again lay emphasis on what I have expressed before. I still hold that unless proper care is taken there are possibilities of exports and imports being affected. But the Hon'ble President having given the assurance that the trade interests will be properly protected, I do not propose to move my amendment.

Amendment not moved

Schedule as amended was then put and carried

Clause 1 of the Bill was put and carried

The title and preamble were next put and carried

Rama Varmha Tampuran, M.B.E. *(Chief Secretary to Government)*: Sir, I move that the Cochin Sales Tax Bill be taken up and finally passed tomorrow.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: I second it.

Mr. President: Tomorrow being a day allotted for non-official business, I would like to know whether Hon'ble members have any objection to take up this item of official business tomorrow.

Several Voices: No objection; no ojection.

Motion put and carried

9. The Cochin Verumpattamdars Act (Amendment) Bill

Mr. President: I have received a request from Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan that the reconsideration of his Verumpattamdars Act Amendment Bill be taken up before we continue the discussion on the introduction of the Tenancy Act (Amendment) Bill, the reason being if the Tenancy Bill is taken up next there may not be any possibility of reaching the reconsideration of the Verumpattrmdar's Act (Amendment) Bill. Therefore, if the Hon'ble Members agree, we may take up that Bill now.

(As the House assented agreement, the Verumpattamdars Act (Amendment) Bill was taken up for reconsideration).

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* Sir, I beg to move the following amendment.—

For clause 3 (2) of the Bill, the following shall be substituted, namely.—

(2) For sub-section (2) the following shall be substituted.—

"(2) When a Verumpattamdar is sought to be evicted on the grounds specified in clause (c) or clause (d) of sub-section (1), if at the first hearing of the suit the verumpattamdar pays or tenders to the lessor the pattam in arrear together with interest thereon and his full costs of the suit or if at the first hearing of the suit he gives such security as the court thinks sufficient for making such payment within fifteen days and such payment is made within the said period of fifteen days, the court shall, in lieu of making a decree for eviction, pass an order condoning the default and thereupon the verumpattamdar shall hold the property leased as if the default had not occurred. Where the payments referred to above are not made or tendered at the first hearing of the suit or within fifteen days thereof in case security is furnished, the court shall not either extend the time for or condone the delay in the payment but shall be bound to order the eviction of the verumpattamdar from the holding.

Explanation.—"First hearing means the date fixed in the summons served on the verumpattamdar for his appearance under Rule 6 of Order V or in the notice issued to him under Rule 5(1) (c) of Order IX of the Cochin Code of Civil Procedure, XXIX of 1111, as the case may be".

Now, the difference between the existing clause in the Bill and this present one is, we are substituting the words "first hearing" in the place of "hearing". That is the only change. The object of the change is to see that the landlord gets his amount in proper time and that he is not unnecessarily delayed for the dues that are to be paid to him. If the word "hearing" alone is put there, there is a chance of the word being interpreted as any hearing even after first hearing, and even hearing in appeal, second appeal, and so on. Therefore, if the word "hearing" is left as it is it may include hearing in first appeal, second appeal or the first hearing of suit. We all know there are many hearings in a suit other than the first hearing. The object of the amendment is to see that the tenant pays at the first opportunity in the Court and in the presence of the presiding officer what is due to the landlord.

What the House was pressing for was that an opportunity should be given to him in court to pay down the dues. That he will get even now.

Rao Sahib K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* Will the Hon'ble Member be satisfied with giving effect to this amendment to future cases alone and for the pending cases to be governed by some other provision. According to the amendment as it is the pending cases will go out of the ambit of the Act.

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* Does the Amendment Bill take cognisance of the Existing suits?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Yes. On page 2 of the Bill you will find that.

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* Does that clause have retrospective effect, that is what I ask?

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Yes, whether it is in the original court or in the Appeal Court.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Sir, the point now raised by the Hon'ble Member is this. When this amendment was moved it was pointed out on behalf of Government that the words "first hearing" is suggested because the word "hearing" as it stands in the Bill will include even cases which are pending and even cases which may come in first appeal or second appeal. Whether this amendment will have the purpose of giving retrospective effect in such cases is the point raised now.

Now, this amendment will not apply retrospectively in such cases which are pending because evidently all such cases referred to by the amendment, the first hearing has passed and therefore there should not be any retrospective effect in those cases. According to the intention which the House had at the time the word "hearing" was not really intended to convey that meaning which is now sought to be given to it. Government had only stated that a doubt may arise if the word "hearing" is used without the word "first" in the clause as passed by the House may lead to this result and consequently the landlord will have to wait indefinitely without payment of the pattam. That is not a certain finding, but only a doubt. The purpose of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

amendment is not to give retrospective operation. The point of giving retrospective effect is a point which has to be considered independently. And Government will consider that when an amendment is moved to that effect to the Verumpattamdar's Act or when it is brought forward in any other recognised mode.

Rao Sahib K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* Do not those people need protection? By this amendment, you shut out in a way all protection.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* There is only one difference. 3 months time is even now allowed according to the Statute. It is only after we pass the Amendment Bill of Mr. Kumaran Ezhuthassan the three months' time will be taken away. It is not a case where after a due date he has to rush to court. Such persons will suffer unless retrospective effect is given by some course.

Rao Sahib K. Ayyappan *(Ezhuvas-Kanayannur):* Will the Government be pleased to consider this aspect of the matter?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Government cannot give an answer off-hand on that point. It will be considered by the Government when a point is raised in the shape of some amendment later.

Mr. President: Certainly, we will take note of it.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Sir, I second the amendment.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* Mr. President, As the person responsible for introducing this Amending Bill which is now recommitted to this House and on which the Hon'ble Revenue Member has moved an amendment; I feel it my duty, Sir, to place before this House the real plight in which the Verumpattomdar is placed as a result of my endeavours to help them. I placed this Bill before this House in Makaram 1120, *i.e.*, within this side of one year after the passing of the Verumpattomdars Act. That Bill contained a clause that this amendment of Section 20 will be deemed to have been in the Act when it was passed, *i.e.*, that clause was to have retrospective effect from the date of the Act. The object of that was that this most equitable thing should be done to a cultivator, *viz.*, that his default in payment of jenmy's dues should be condoned if he deposits the amount in court on suit. That is the amendment which I moved at the earlist stage which unfortunately, could not be passed. Therefore it is that in the Amending Bill which I placed before this House in 1120 I sought to have that retrospective effect clause, which unfortunately, after nearly 2 years of labour in the Select Committee stage, unfortunately for the tenant, came up here, and the clause that wanted to give retrospective effect to that Amending Act was unfortunately lost. So, what is put into our hands now, as was observed by the Hon'ble Advocate-General, is this. That is, when the Bill is passed with the amendment on recommittal and royal assent is had for it, the shape of the bill will be that a tenant who fails to pay pattom on the due date, looses three months grace period which the original bill contained with the result that if in a case where the pattom is payable on the 30th of Kanni 1121, if the jenmi belongs to that category of jenmies who should be wiped away from the country very soon, he can go to the court on the first of Kumbham, *i.e.*, the next dey after the due date. That is the mischief that I have brought about by Amending Bill which was conveyed and discussed here with the best of intentions in this behalf. The Jenmi may file a suit the next day after the pattom falls due and the three month's time allowed to the tenant is taken away. Now in such a suit what is sought by the Hon'ble Member for Revenue is that the dues sued should be placed before the Court on the first hering date or within fifteen days after time is sought for and granted on security. So, whereas the original Bill had given three month's time to the tenant, the Bill that is recommitted and to be amended hereafter takes away the three months of the ultimate benefit that the tenant gets. If a Jenmi seizes to clauses (c) and (d) of Section 8 dealing with the non-payment of pattom on due dates, the tenant gets the time up to the first hearing or at the maximum 15 days from the first hearing. Now, in our Civil Courts, unless the defendants are far away from Cochin, if they are anywhere in Cochin, the first hearing of a suit in most cases is posted with in one month of the filing of the suit. So what the defaulted tenant now get is, he gets one month plus 15 days, that is the time which can be had on funishing security. Otherwise, where he gets 90 days as per the provision of the original Act, by this Bill he gets a maximum of 45 days. I have my own qualms in my mind as to whether I have not done him a real harm with best of intentions for want of co-operation from my friends at the proper time. What is the use of regret, Sir? We cannot at this stage when a Bill is recommitted for reconsideration by the House move any sort of amendment. So, it is a case of either accepting the amendment and take the chance of getting the Bill passed with the amendment or take the chance of the Bill already passed without this amendment being assented to by His Highness.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. P Govinda Menon (*Ernakulam*): Mr. President, I raise a point of order whether this House is incompetent to have an amendment when this Bill is recommitted under section 27 of the Government of Cochin Act. Section 27 says: "where a Bill has been passed by the Council, the Diwan may, instead of presenting it for the assent of His Highness, return it to the Council for reconsideration in whole or in part, together with any amendments which he may recommend. My submission Mr. President, is that "reconsideration" by the House includes tabling of amendments also.

Mr. President: Which section do you quote?

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Ernakulam):* I am reading from section 27 of the Act. There, it is stated "return it to the Council for reconsideration" My submission is that "reconsideration" of this House will become futile and will not be complete and perfect unless the term "reconsideration" also includes the right to move amendments.

Mr. President: Rule 38 also governs the case. Our point is whether it is open to Hon'ble Members of the House to move amendments to this amendment moved by the Diwan Peishkar, is that not?

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Ernakulam):* Yes, Sir.

Mr. President: Before, giving a decision, I would like to hear the Advocate-General's opinion.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* According to the Rule 38, when a Bill is returned by the Diwan for reconsideration by the Council, the point or points referred for consideration shall be put before the Council, by the President....." Therefore it is only that point that is before this House and the House can either accept it or reject it. My view is they cannot move amendment to the amendment suggested by the Diwan. If they are not prepared to accept the amendment they can reject it. No amendment can be moved to the amendment placed before the House.

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Ernakulam)*: Mr. President.—Under section 27 the Diwan is returning to the Council for reconsideration in whole or in part the Bill and it is because the Diwan is sending the Bill for reconsideration by this House that the Government is itself ge tting the right of amendment because the Government so far as this House is concerned is not in a position anyway superior to any other member of this House. The Diwan Peishkar himself gets the rights to move the amendment because it is sent for reconsideration by the Diwan to the House. It is in our reconsideration that the Diwan Peishkar is moving an amendment on behalf of the Government. If the powers of this House is restricted in the way pointed out by the learned Advocate General' I think, the power to recommit the legislation to this House will become futile. Because Government itself will have no power to move an amendment. And when a member of Government is moving an amendment it means that any other member can also move an amendment. The Diwan is sending back this Bill only for re-consideration and because it is sent for re-consideration the Diwan Peishkar gets a right to move the amendment. Otherwise the word "consideration" will become meaningless.

Mr. President: I am not quite clear how Rule 38 limits the powers of the House.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Under section 27 of the Act there is power given to the Diwan to return it to the Council for re-consideration in whole or in part. But under Rule 38 when a Bill is returned by the Diwan for re-consideration by the Council the point or points referred for consideration shall be put before the Council by the President and shall be discussed and voted upon.....

Mr. President : Now what is the implication of "discussion"?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Discussion of amendment.

Mr. President : Would not that imply alteration in the amendment ?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Further amendments to amendment suggested by the Diwan, which alone is placed before the House, are not contemplated.

Mr. President : I think it is surely open to the House to move an amendment to the amendment to the Bill.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* My view is, it is restricted to mere discussion.

Mr. President : Is it not putting a narrow interpretation on the word "discussion"?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-Gene-al):* Rule 38 says that the point or points referred shall be discussed and voted upon. Therefore that indicates that it can be discussed merely.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. President : What is the interpretation put on the word "discussion"?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Sir, that was the position taken when the Tenancy Bill was similarly recommitted.

Mr P. Govinda Menon *(Ernakulam):* There was no point of order raised then.

Mr. President : Was it not raised then?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General) :* No, Sir.

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar) :* The reconsideration must be on the point or points referred for consideration.

Mr. President : My point is this, that the words "reconsideration" and "discussion" may cover also amendment. I think it may.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: That position is not acceptable to Government. Because by doing that the purpose of the re-commital will be frustrated. The Diwan on a perusal of the Bill passed by the Council finds that a particular point of view of the Council is not acceptable. The Diwan therefore suggests an amendment on that point and sends it to the Council for reconsideration.

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Ernakulam):* I don't think the Diwan takes up the attitude that the methods suggested by him is the only possible way.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* That suggestion is open to discussion. They cannot suggest to the Diwan again that another method is possible. Now the Diwan makes one suggestion to the House. Of course it is for us to say whether we are prepared to accept his suggestion or not. The House cannot make a suggestion again.

Mr. President : The House in the course of the discussion can indicate any alteration to the amendment which I think might be acceptable but Hon'ble Members cannot themselves effect the amendment. I accept the Advacate-General's view on the point of order.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri) :* So can we suggest amendments in that manner?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* Yes.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* I was saying, Sir, that according to my light which has been now corrected by my Hon'ble friend the Leader of the opposition and with the co-operation of the Hon'ble the Advocate-General that is considering this amendment on reconsideration, we could at least suggest certain other amendments that are necessary in view of this amendment which of course as observed by the Hon'ble Chair we, ourselves, may not be competent to move. The Government that is there can certainly be helpful, as I believe they will be, and as they have done on previous occasions. I hope our suggestions will be acted upon and the Bill will at least be made not harmful to the tenantry but as helpful to them as possible.

I was observing, Sir, that the result of our activities all these two years is that what they enjoyed by way of grace—3 months time for payment—is now taken away when this amendment is passed and in its place the tenant gets 45 days normally. There may be cases where the first hearing comes a little later than one month after the date of filing the suit. Therefore what I submit is this: Unless as suggested by the Hon'ble Rao Sahib, pending suits at whatever stage they be whether pending in the original court or appeal court—first appellate court or second appellate court—executions being of course excluded—must at least be moved. Something helpful in that line and workable on behalf of the tenant may kindly be done by the Government, by themselves moving amendments at the third reading. That is a suggestion which I wish to place before the Government.

Another thing which I have to place before the Government is this.—By this amendment what in fact has been done is to embody here the principles underlying section 111 of the Transfer of Property Act. That section deals with condonation against forfeiture on non-payment of pattom. Whatever is there in that section is copied here also. Even 15 days stipulated there is copied here. Instead of that I suggest that the period granted on security may be more than 15 days; it may be another month. That is another suggestion that I place before the Government. I do not think, Sir, that any useful purpose will be served by my dialating upon this amendment any more. So I accept the government amendment in my helplessness, but with these words, "that for no fault of the sponsor of the Bill time from 1120 Meenam when it was sent to a Select Committee has lapsed". A class of Jenmies from the day on which notice for leave to introduce this Bill was given by me in Thulam 1120 have been rushing into courts as will be seen from the statistics collected by me through questions and answers. Very many suits have been filed.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Very many suits have been decreed, and in many cases evictions have been effected. A good many of them have been executed and the tenant driven from farm land and his homestead. There are yet suits decreed but not executed. There are suits still pending. Something may be done for these people by Amendment or Proclamation. I have a complaint Sir, that this Bill which is now recommitted was passed by this House as early as Meenam of last year. And the fact that the recommittal has taken place only today shows how the Governmental machinery is working between the tenantry and the oppressor of the tenantry. The wind is blowing that way now. That is a point which I have to place before the Government. And therefore considering all the sufferings that the tenantry had been put to because of this change of front of the Government I entreat the Government, Sir, to see that what I suggested, and so kindly allowed by the Hon'ble President, may kindly be accepted by the Government and appropriate action by way of amendment on those lines may be brought by the Government at the third reading. I hope and I believe that something is better than nothing. I do not therefore stand in the way of the amendment, because the result of my standing in the way of the amendment is even depositing at the first hearing or within 15 days from the first heering is not going to get the condonation which is the subject matter of the Bill. It is with a sickening heart that I resume my seat, because even the 3 months grace allowed under the Act has been taken away from it due to a variety of causes over which I had absolutely no control.

Mr. P. Govinda Menon *(Ernakulam)*: Mr. President, The Bill has been sent for reconsideration, on a very clear and definite point. The point is this.—In Mr. Kumaran Ezhuthassan's bill the words used are "on the hearing of the suits"; Government considers that those words are indefinite and some definiteness must be there. The words "hearing of the suits' may mean first hearing, next hearing or any subsequent hearing as pointed by the Hon'ble Member for Revenue. Now therefore the words "first hearing" are used in the amendments brought by the Diwan Peishkar. It is definite in the amendment. But in doing so, even in considering the point it has been sent for reconsideration my submission to this House is that there is a grevious omission. If the amendment brought by the Diwan Peishkar is passed it will certainly benefit those tenants against whom suits will be filed after this amendment becomes law. That is to say if this Bill becomes law on the last day of Karkadagam 1121 it will apply to those suits that are filed from 1st Chingam 1122. But the point for reconsideration of which the Bill has been sent back to this House takes in something more. The words "hearing of the suit" are indefinite and it will not be beyond the scope of the reconsideration sought by the Diwan if the words "first hearing" are defined in the way in which I submit before this House. This explanation "First hearing" means the date fixed in the summons served on the verumpattamdar for his appearance under Rule 7 of Order V or in the notice issued to him under Rule 5 (1) (c) of Order IX of the Cochin Code of Civil Procedure, XXIX of 1111, as the case may be. It is this definition which makes it clear that this will be applicable only to suits filed hereafter. If a proviso is added by the Diwan Peishkar to the following effect it will not be going beyond the point for which the Bill is sent for reconsideration and will make the point clear; "Provided that in the case of pending suits, appeals and second appeals, first hearing shall mean the next hearing on which the first appeal or second appeal as the case may be is taken up after this act comes into force". If the words "first hearing" are so defined we will not be going beyond the point which this House has been asked to reconsider. Now the word hearing is taken away and the words "first hearing" are introduced. The words "first hearing" are definite in a certain way in the amendment with respect to suits which are to be field heareafter, but with respect to pending suits in the first appeal or second appeal stage "first hearing" means the next hearing after this Bill become law. I request the Government to accept my suggestion so that all classses of tenants against whom suits are pending may be benefited. As I submitted it is not going beyond the ambit of the point for reconsideration of which this Bill has been sent back. With these words I resume my seat.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General)*: Sir, Hon'ble Members are fully aware why Government on the floor of this House are not able to take an immediate decision upon this very vital issue raised on the floor of this House. The Diwan President has been kind enough to inform the Hon'ble Members that the point has been noted. It is a mattter for the consideration of the Diwan, and the Diwan President, even though he is Diwan, of the State, will have to take advice in these matters and that too constitutionally. Therefore I think it will be too much for the Hon'ble Members to expect an unqualified answer from me as to whether Government are now prepared to state it on the floor of the House. I can only

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

make a statement as the Diwan President has already stated that the feeling of the House on this point has been noted and the matter will certainly receive the earnest consideration of the Diwan.

Mr. V. R. Krishnan Ezhuthassan *(Oorakam):* Can we know the result to-morrow?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I don't think it is possible. I must think tomorrow is too short a time for the Diwan to take a decision on that vital point, because this legislation has a history of its own.

Mr. V. R. Krishnan Ezhuthassan *(Oorakam):* History of dragging on?

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* The provisions regarding retrospective effects were thrown out by the House at the time when the Bill was last passed by the House. An identical point raised was whether irrespective of the question as to whether "hearing" made use of in this clause will take in any other hearing than the first hearing upon the principle whether this relief which is sought to be given by that clause could not be given by a straight forward clause, *i.e.*, by giving a retrospective operation that was discussed on the floor of the House and unfortunately after discussion it was thrown out. That time attention was not concentrated on the word whether it will take in any hearing than the first hearing. Therefore it is, that I for myself do not think that the Diwan will be in a position to take a decision upon that point tomorrow for an announcement on the floor of this House.

Mr. President: I may add a word or two to what the Advocate-General has said. I think it is most unlikely that I shall be able to come to a decision by tomorrow in a matter of this sort. The matter is too difficult.

Mr. Paramel Ipe Ipe *(Kunnamkulam):* Mr. President, I wish to give one suggestion regarding the definition that is given in this amendment for the words "first hearing". Now, to be very technical regarding law of procedure, even a return of the process without refusal is considered to be proper service under the Code of Civil Procedure. A slight manipulation on the part of the process server would be enough to deny the defendant a hearing. When the process is returned by the process-server it tantamounts to a refusal of the process and the Bench at the first hearing decrees the suit *ex parte*. What I would suggest in that case is that the definition of the words "first hearing should be made more rigorous and that it should be so worded as to say "first hearing after personal service of the process on the defendant or any male member of the family of the defendant". Otherwise, it will simply depend upon the whims and fancies of the particular process server. So I would humbly suggest that "the first hearing" must be defined in such a way without putting it to the rigour of the term as defined in the Code of Civil Procedure regarding process service.

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* I have nothing to add to what I said before. The Hon'ble Members are suggesting certain things. Unless what is placed before the House is accepted, there is no go.....

Rao Sahib K. Ayyappan (*Ezhuvas-Kanayannur*): Bring amendments tomorrow.

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* Tomorrow it is not possible. To give effect to your suggestions, you may bring further amendments afterwards.

Amendment put and carried

Rao Sahib A. Madhava Prabhu *(Diwan Peishkar):* Sir, I move that the Cochin Verumpattamdars Act (Amendment) Bill as amended may be taken up and finally passed tomorrow.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I second it.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan *(Vadakkancheri):* May I be allowed to make a suggestion; Sir? Now that the Bill is to come up for third reading tomorrow, although it was stated that it will not be possible to bring in amendments tomorrow, I suggest why not an attempt be made to have the amendment, suggested by the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition, introduced at the third reading. After all, sitting round a table, the Diwan, the Advocate-General, the Revenue Member the Leader of the Opposition and poor me will be able to devise something to tide over the difficulty. I make that prayer, Sir, at this stage also.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon *(Advocate-General):* I do not think it will be possible to rush through this important matter like that.

Motion that the Bill as amended be taken up for final consideration tomorrow was put and carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly